

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending. By this amendment, the title, abstract and claims 1 and 2 are amended, and new claims 5-10 are added.

The cross reference to related applications has been updated as required.

The office action objects to the title, abstract, and claim 2 which have been amended. Withdrawal of the objections is requested.

The office action rejects claims 1-4 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. It is submitted that the amendment of claim 1 obviates this rejection, and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.


The office action rejects claims 1-4 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.. It is submitted that the amendments obviate these rejections. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

The office action rejects claims 1-4 under 35 USC 103 over Keckler (US Pat. 5,574,939) in view of Cook (US Pat. 5,301,340). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Neither Keckler nor Cook disclose or suggest one instruction code can be processed by the plurality of computing devices concurrently by designating, according to designation data in an instruction code stored in said memory, a plurality of the computing devices for executing said instruction code, as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, even if combined, the resulting combination would not render obvious claim 1 or any of the dependent claims. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee relevant to this filing to Kenyon & Kenyon Deposit Account No. 11-0600. A duplicate of this sheet is attached.

Respectfully submitted,


David Zibelli
Registration No. 36,394

Date: December 29, 2004

KENYON & KENYON
1500 K Street, N.W. - Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005-1257
Tel: (202) 220-4200
Fax: (202) 220-4201

DC533637v1 djz/ske